



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

we must in each instance correct courageously the evils we discover our ignorance and cowardice to have permitted.

The savage tribe has its code of honesty, and the individual member, with his narrow and simple life, without thought, may live up to it. The ordinary tribal precepts we still follow, while with a constantly changing condition of society we fail to study and apply to its new and varying circumstances the rigid rules peculiar to the essence of honesty.

## THE WAR HAS NOT DESTROYED

### V

## The Social Importance of Individual Behavior

By ARTHUR DEERIN CALL

ANTIDOTE FOR MADNESS

**D**R. STEWART PATON, physician and psychiatrist, in a communication to the *New York Times* under date of January 17, 1920, writes:

"The aphorism 'madness and freedom exist not together' is generally attributed to Epictetus. Doubtless the kind of madness to which the Greek philosopher referred was marked by symptoms similar to those occurring in people who, according to Emerson, are out of communication with their reason. The freedom with which such madness is incompatible is a sign of the ability to exercise a rational control over conduct.

"Why is it that with so many bitter experiences man has not yet thought it worth while to take more active measures to prevent the development of the madness that jeopardizes his personal liberty? . . .

"Bickerings and bloodshed mark the conflict between madness and liberty. . . . The entire world is in a ferment, organized society is threatened, and still our universities, which take a foremost part in preparing for a military victory, seem indifferent to the vaporings of psychopathic personalities, which are a much greater menace to democracy than the German Army two years ago. There seems to be only one possible way to restore the law and order: the study of human behavior by intensive methods; and thereafter the application of such knowledge as may be obtained to making secure the foundations of personal liberty against the attacks of madness."

These words seem to be significant. If the attention of men be thus called again to the social importance of individual behavior, the war will not have been a net loss. By calling attention to this remedy for our after-war madness Dr. Paton has rendered a service.

And there must be an antidote for this madness. It will probably be generally agreed that the only life secure against this devastating madness is what I would call the experimental life. Freedom seems to require that man shall look upon his life as a process of importance. Self-examination, therefore, if not overdone, is a very rational and essential preparation for any truly successful or zestful freedom. Extravagant waste of life begets madness. Where the poor squander it ex-

clusively for warmth, food, and shelter merely; where the better off in materials squander it for more materials merely; where the very rich seek more riches merely, the tendency to become mad is about equally peculiar in each case. But the truly experimental life enjoys the sensation of its own growth and tends to reach the satisfactions which are more permanent and sane.

In every nation there are true spirits living nobly this experimental life; a minority to be sure, but a very hopeful minority. The altogether significant and momentous thing about this minority is its conception of life as a worthy experiment, a triumphant conception which ever tends to become a triumphant fact. Because of them our coward ideas tend to become heroic ideas. Without them the forces of material and shop and field can avail little. Indeed, the sanity of the world is in their hands.

Out of this idea of the minority pursuing the experimental life arises our notion of the oneness of humanity, the solidarity of the race. This doctrine of solidarity means that we are "members one of another;" that there is indeed a oneness in human interests; that the weal of each is the weal of all, and that the weal of all is the weal of each; that one thrives only in a commonwealth and that the commonwealth thrives only in its ones; indeed, that there is no such thing as purely individual vice or purely individual virtue.

A significant thought this, of the social solidarity. It takes the help of thousands that we may put on those shoes. Men labor in South America, in Egypt, in the mines of Pennsylvania, along the shores of Lake Superior, across vast stretches of ocean, and over countless miles of railroad; men toil in the woods of Maine, in the shipyards of England, and in the factories of Germany and America for us first. It takes another army of men to raise that cup of coffee to our lips, men laboring around the globe.

It is of special importance just now, this interdependence of all people and of all peoples; but as a conception it is not new. It is the central theme of the doctrine of Paul of Tarsus, of all the Christian fathers, and of Jesus as well. One who counts his ancestors back nine generations finds at that short range the inspiring number of 256 grandfathers and 256 grandmothers. Thus our interrelations seem to be limitless. A seed of thought sown in the mind of a child today may influence a tribe in a thousand years. That a war between Austria and Serbia became a world war is now seen to have been inevitable from the beginning. The sanity of the world can be counted upon only in proportion as men recognize this law of social solidarity, this interrelation of peoples, and conduct themselves with wisdom accordingly.

### SIGNIFICANCE OF INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR

Since the various types of madness peculiar to human behavior are highly contagious; since individual behavior because of this law of mutual interdependence of men tends to influence communities and nations, and since the problem of national behavior can be understood only in proportion as we understand individual behavior, the problem of individual behavior is seen to be important.

For example, there are times when a man feels called upon not to do what he ordinarily might do, or to do what he ordinarily would not do, were it not for the relations existing between him and some one else. He is driven sometimes to ask, "Is it right for me thus to gratify myself when it will undoubtedly mean some real harm to another?" Thus the problem of behavior, because of the influence of example, gives rise to a number of inquiries. For instance, is it ever proper for a man to defy the whims of other people? Where there are so many shades and casts of thought, just what is his duty in the light of the influence his example may have upon those with whom he must come in touch? He realizes thus that his behavior may make or break the life or happiness or well-being of others.

Therefore vital matters hang upon the answer to these questions.

We are influenced more by example than by precept. The enduring influences for good are not so much what preachments may say as those little unconscious heroisms and kindnesses or of self-denial which are witnessed in others usually when they least suspect.

I know a Christian clergyman, a good fellow, they say. Yet I also happen to know that he lets his semi-invalid wife take all the care of his numerous children, do all the household drudgery without a lift from him day in or day out. On the other hand, I know a middle-aged man who has, naturally without ostentation, sacrificed married life, college and much else, that his younger brother might get an education and prosper in a profession. This self-sacrificing man unconsciously exercises a profound influence in his community. The wife of that minister, wholly unknown to herself, influences profoundly many another, while the preaching of her husband falls mainly upon deaf ears and a diminishing congregation.

Thus the example of behavior more than words is the prime educator of the race. Good advice from faulty example is footless. Men imitate what they see. In no small sense education is an imitation of models. Sir Peter Lely, painter and crayon artist of the seventeenth century, made it a rule never to look at a bad picture for fear that his brush or pencil might become tainted thereby. On the other hand, just to meet certain persons is, we say, a liberal education. Hence Dr. Paton is right. The study of behavior is of the utmost concern in any attempt to overcome the madness threatening the recurring generations.

#### A STUDY OF BEHAVIOR

##### I. Individual Actions of Moral Dignity in Themselves

Assuming that the war has brought this truth more clearly to our consciousness, let us briefly examine certain aspects of human behavior from the point of view of the influence of individual example. For such a purpose we may divide individual actions into two general classes: first, those actions which undoubtedly have a moral importance of their own, which by common consent are of a recognized moral nature; second, those which have no moral dignity in themselves. Each of these in turn, because of certain differences of opinion, present naturally certain subdivisions. The outline seems naturally to arrange itself thus:

##### I. Actions of moral dignity in themselves—

1. Those the normal effect of which is always evil.
2. Those normally evil, but which the actor deems harmless for him personally.
3. Those sometimes evil, but which the actor considers to be good for him personally.

##### II. Actions of no moral dignity in themselves—

1. Yet thought to be such by some.
2. Those which, because of education and environment, may often lead to evil.

As has been said, because of the differences of opinion, individual actions of moral dignity in themselves are divided into three classes. Let us look at them in order.

##### (1) *Actions Always Evil*

There are actions the normal effect of which is always evil. Intemperance in eating is gluttony, in drinking is drunkenness, in sensualities of any kind is death. Gambling and gossiping, one playing for the illegitimate acquisition of another's wealth in money, the other for the illegitimate destruction of his wealth in his reputation, are always evil. To be a party to such things is to dwarf and to blight, is to invite disease, want, brutality, anarchy, and death. They are evil because they run counter to those forces which, as Spencer would say, "efficiently subserve" the ends of real life. Therefore the rule in this class of actions, actions the normal effect of which is always evil, must be, first, last, and always, abstinence; not because of any theological doctrine, but because thus and thus only can life perpetuate itself and society endure. In the present despair over the evil consequence of the war, men may console themselves that this principle survives.

##### (2) *Actions Evil for Some*

There are those actions, positively moral in their significance, which, though regarded as generally evil, are by some people considered as for them personally harmless.

Down this road of reasoning lies many a wrecked life. Debauches, wild flings, and orgies beget debauches, wild flings, and orgies. Since, as Professor James tell us, habit from a psychological point of view is nothing but a new pathway of discharge formed in the brain by which certain incoming currents ever after tend to escape, habit is a factor to be reckoned with. Habit seems to be primarily a physical matter, a law permeating all things in a manner quite mysterious. The cloth of a garment will adjust itself to certain lines and tend always to keep those lines. The clock-seller advises you to let the new clock run a week before trying to regulate it. A piece of paper once folded tends ever to keep its fold. My grandmother's Bible would always open to the fourteenth chapter of St. John. Those vital processes of eating, the holding of the fork, the raising of the spoon, the balancing of a cup, the speed of eating—these are for you no longer thought out; but once they were, with processes of alternating victory and defeat. Thus habits simplify our ordinary activities, increase the accuracy with which they may be performed, and reduce to the minimum the fatigue of commonplaces. As art is the free expression of the

human spirit under the influence of emotion, but subdued and controlled by the principle that reaches unto harmonious and therefore beautiful results, so in that supreme art of life there is a similarly controlling and directing principle which may be called habit. Thus it is of importance that the nervous system shall become an ally and not an enemy. Methods of accuracy, punctuality, success, are at bottom primarily habits. The same thing is true of the converse of these things. Every act or inaction is important, since every consequence becomes a cause under this inexorable law of habit. "We may choose the first," says Goethe, "but we are governed by the second."

Of such is habit, the iron-bound law of good and evil, the basis for our belief in depravity on the one hand and in goodness on the other.

Furthermore, as pointed out by Paulsen, habit does not end with one's self, but tends constantly to reproduce itself in the race. Not long ago a white man and a negro were engaged in cleaning the inside of a boiler. In some way the steam was accidentally turned on. Both rushed frantically for the ladder, the only means of escape. The negro reached the foot of the ladder first. He hesitated. He stopped. He turned to his partner and said: "No, John, you have a wife and a child at home. You go first." The negro was scalded to his death. A man with a black skin, to be sure, but with a spirit the apotheosis of all that is fair and white on the pages of life's story. That act tends to produce heroism in thousands of little ways throughout the world.

If, as Paulsen says, "an examination of the moral judgments pronounced upon human acts and qualities universally leads to the conception of universal welfare as the principle which governs all determinations of value," and universal welfare depends largely upon the habits of men, then habits wheresoever are of supreme importance; and, because of this importance, men for the most part agree that they should abstain rigorously from all acts or thoughts the normal effects of which are evil, even though they seem at the time possibly harmless.

### (3) *Good, but Not so Recognized by Some*

There remains one other class of activities decidedly of moral significance which, from the individual point of view, are good, but from the point of view of some others are evil; and for one to indulge in them may lead to some harm, real or imaginary, to the lives of other persons. Familiar examples of this are golfing on Sunday, going to the movies, reading novels.

Take the question of Sunday observance. The Blue Laws of Connecticut, as reported, insisted that no one should cross the river on the Sabbath but an authorized clergyman. No one must travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep houses, cut hair, shave, or kiss his or her children on the Sabbath. And why? Certainly not because any such things are taught by Jesus. His teachings are quite the opposite. "The Sabbath," said He, "was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." Neither because of the teachings of the Old Testament; for all through that book the Sabbath is a day of delight, of joy, of holiness, and of rest. That is what the word Sabbath means—rest. But rest means neither

stagnation nor gloom. The Blue Law conception must have crept in through the Puritan reaction against the pomp, show, and ritual of the Church of England, a perfectly natural reaction. The result, however, has been quite a new interpretation of Sunday observance.

Certainly the obligation to remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy, does not rest upon the fourth commandment. It is a truism now that the great truths of the Bible are not true because they are in the Bible; they are in the Bible because they are true. The obligation to keep the Sabbath lies rather in its usefulness and necessity to man. It is a demand out of a human need. During the French Revolution it was attempted to substitute one day in ten in place of one day in seven as a Sabbath. The plan failed.

Experience seems to show that it will not do to adopt a purely secular Sabbath, a day of mere frivolity, a time for indiscriminate pleasure seeking. The Sabbath is a time in which to break the enslaving routine of the daily grind. It is opportunity for repose, for acquiring and dispensing food, not for the material only but for the spiritual body as well. It is man's chance to visit the sick and the fatherless, to dream to the cadences of music, to search out the beautiful, to pray. The Sabbath is man's leisure in which to drink at the fountains of enduring hope, to reach unto eternal things. The law must provide that every person shall have one day in seven for his Sabbath.

There is, however, probably little hope in the various laws which aim to regulate the observance of this profitable institution. Mechanical and perfunctory observances with all their dreary forms are futile. It would seem that libraries, art galleries, homes, and all good places should be open on this day above all other days. Macaulay once wrote:

"We are not poorer but richer because we have, for many ages, rested one day in seven. That day is not lost. While industry is suspended, while the exchange is silent, while no smoke rises from the factory, a process is going on as important to the wealth of the nation as any process which is performed on more busy days. Man, machine of machines, is repairing and winding up, so that he returns to his labors with a clearer intellect, with livelier spirit, and with renewed corporeal vigor."

The Sabbath may be a time for brain inspiration, a day in which to leave behind all slavery to materials; a time to listen to spiritual men uttering spiritual things, indeed to utter a few, to feel the heartbeats of some old master on the pages of some story or poem, to listen to birds, the voices of children, the orchestras of woods. As Farrar said out of England:

"Nothing may be so potent as our recurrent Sundays to make us realize our true manhood, our divine prerogative amid the benumbing bondage of dull routine. On a French tomb was once carved this striking epitaph: 'He was born a man; and died a grocer.' No one who saved his Sundays can ever merge the sacredness of his immortality in his ledger or money-bags, or be tempted to forget that behind the laborer or the mechanic stands the man in the dignity of God's image, and with the sign of his redemption marked visibly upon his forehead."

A clergyman has sent to me his thought about the Sabbath. He says:

"I believe in the Sabbath, which has its grounds in human needs, physical, mental, and spiritual; but I also believe that the sacredness of one day above another is, under the Christian dispensation, as under the old dispensation, merely a concession to human weakness, to be honored only so long as men continue spiritually immature and cannot live on the principle that in God's world all days are equally sacred, and all tasks faithfully performed are holy. In a perfected Christian society we shall know no artificial line separating sacred from secular days or tasks; all history shall be sacred, and none profane."

These are words from a New England clergyman.

There are many good people sincerely opposed to the theater, "movie," or otherwise, and some may think themselves hurt if you attend it. Yet the theater has influenced the world for good during a much longer time than the pulpit. Since the drama began so many centuries before Christ in India and China, men have witnessed the creation of that first theater to Dionysius at the foot of the Acropolis in Athens; the coming of the dramatic and imaginative Æschylus five hundred years before Christ; the serene, pious, lofty, imperially perfect Sophocles a century later; the lesser light, but greater tragedian, the more pathetic, human, and versatile Euripides also in old and classic Attica. Thus it can be shown that actors have held a genuine and in large part a beneficial sway over the beliefs and actions of men.

True, the drama has had its ups and downs. It was practically exterminated by the church in the fourth century of our era, only to be taken up by the church itself in the "Miracle Plays" of the middle age. And then came the awakening of the Renaissance in Italy, which let loose the forces which gave to France the strong, brilliant tragedian Corneille, the gracious color and glorious strength of Racine, and the delicate, subtle, elaborate, Moliere, with his tenderness, irony, and wit.

It was this same flowering in the fourteenth century which later gave to the world out of Elizabethan England our Shakespeare. Of the Puritanic despisers of the theater we are forced to ask, "What shall be done with this man, this Shakespeare, this light of all lights, and seer?" Shakespeare! Master of all the masters in comedy, lyric, and tragedy! Shakespeare! The perfect mirror of all human weakness and strength, of misery and beauty! Shakespeare! Knowing, without seeming ever to have learned, all the philosophies, all the sciences, and all the arts! Shakespeare! Penetrating to the depths of human nature and revealing man to himself in colors he had never surmised. Shakespeare! The Anglo-Saxon's most wonderful piece of work; himself, "how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in apprehension how like a god!" What shall we do with him, this man who harnesses the passions of men that they do his bidding, this prophet who with Dante epitomizes the faith and practice of Christian civilization everywhere? Certainly we cannot ignore this interpreter of themes so various as the breaking of the ties which bind father and children as in *Lear*; the ties which bind subject and sovereign as in *Macbeth*;

the infinity of a human intellect wholly laid bare before us as in *Hamlet*; the breaking of the ties most sacred of all, those golden threads uniting husband and wife, as in the sad, sad tale of *Othello*.

The theater is the mouthpiece of this Shakespeare. It is the medium for the expression of all in his noble line, each of whom advances or continues some truth or art enduringly. For some of us attendance upon it is certainly good. But if there are they who will feel grieved and some possibly weakened in their moral life if we support it, what shall we do?

Before answering, let us remind ourselves of those pious persons radically opposed to the reading of all novels and fiction. What of them? In the first place, they seem to have a misconception of what fiction is. Fiction, usually in prose, not dramatic, is a work of the imagination to be sure. It is usually in narrative form, but it is biography, after all. In the best of Dickens, Scott, Eliot, Hawthorne, it is truer than most so-called real biography. As Aristotle says of poetry:

"If it be objected to the poet that he has not represented things conformable to truth, he may answer that he has represented them as they should be. And this is the proper answer. The imitations of poetry should resemble the paintings of Zeuxis: the example should be more perfect than nature. It is not by writing verse or prose that the historian and the poet are distinguished: the work of Herodotus might be versified, but it would still be a species of history. They are distinguished by this, that one relates what has been, the other what might be. On this account poetry is more philosophical and a more excellent thing than history. For poetry is chiefly conversant about general truth, history about particular."

And so of fiction, it is usually more excellent than ordinary fact. But certain pious people do not see this, and the sight of other people reading fiction pains them. What shall one do, and what shall one teach?

In the right enjoyment of the Sabbath, in attending the theater, in reading fiction, in patronizing general athletics, in all other lines of action the normal result of which seems to be nothing but good, the ethical principle seems to be that one defy without ostentation all whims and notions to the contrary. As in the first two cases of actions decidedly of moral importance the principle was abstinence, so it would seem equally clear that here the rule should be indulgence though some harm does seem inevitable.

## II. Actions of No Moral Dignity in Themselves

### (1) Yet Thought by Some to be of Moral Dignity

And then, there are those tantalizing little problems relating to actions of no real moral importance in themselves as we look at them, which, however, many people do consider important.

The oft-quoted Blue Laws said:

"Whoever wears clothes trimmed with silver, gold, or bone lace above one shilling a yard, shall be presented by the grand jurors, and the selectmen shall attach the estate three hundred pounds."

"Whosoever brings cards or dice into the Dominion shall be fined five pounds."

"No one shall eat mince pies, dance, play cards, or play any instrument of music except the drum, trumpet, or jews-harp."

"No man shall court a maid in person or by letter, without obtaining the consent of the parents; five pounds penalty for the first offense, ten pounds for the second, and for the third imprisonment during the pleasure of the court."

These old laws, real or imaginary, typify a spirit that has had a decided influence upon American life and, for the most part, it must be agreed a most salutary and beneficial one. One must be quite unballasted to ridicule the somber rigorism of the Puritanic spirit. There was a mighty truth behind that, a nation-making truth which history will ever view with consideration and respect.

Some years ago there was a girl brought up in the atmosphere of this unique rigorism, often severe and almost pitiless, who, upon becoming a woman, revolted against it all and left her church for what she believed a more liberal and reasonable faith. After becoming the principal of the oldest normal school in America, she once asked: "Why, when I am looking for a faithful and competent teacher, do I seek a young woman schooled in the Puritanic ways in which I no longer believe?" Indeed, with all his ascetic disregard for the luxuries of this life, there was a sterling worth behind the character of the Puritan, and America has reaped the benefit.

But most men have luxuries which they enjoy. There are legitimate expenditures not absolutely needed and demanded by the stern exigencies of mere existence. No one dares attempt to classify the needs of all classes of people or of any two people. Needs depend upon a variety of circumstances. General Lee would never carry an umbrella; and my itinerant Methodist minister of a great-grandfather made it a practice never even to leave the house without a sermon in his pocket. It is related, is it not, of Diogenes the Cynic that, upon attending what is equivalent to our "Church Fair," he posed himself and, sticking his hands, I suppose, deep in the pocket of his toga, said: "By George! how many things there are here which I do not want!" Yet undoubtedly there were things there needed somewhat by a few; it is sometimes so. There are needs not to be accounted for on the Exchange. Beauty in the useful furniture of the home, in consistently adorned houses, in churches, in dress, in public buildings and parks, beauty in any of the arts is a luxury; but since it is an indulgence which on the whole and in the long run benefits more when indulged than when ignored it is a legitimate luxury, indeed for most of us a necessity.

Relaxing entertainment is often a prime necessity. As is well known, Lincoln's Cabinet called upon him one day and, considering the awful news of war, they were quite surprised to find the President deep, not in political papers or war news, but in one of Artemus Ward's humorous sketches. When the Cabinet entered, Lincoln looked up, read to them with great laughter an extract, swung his large feet off the desk, and drew from a drawer the Emancipation Proclamation. Artemus Ward and Lincoln's inexhaustible appreciation of humor were no small factors in the shaping of the destiny of this nation a half century ago.

There is little doubt that shining one's boots on the Sabbath day, automobiling within the speed limits, keeping a dog or a fast horse lawfully, carrying an unnecessary cane on occasion, smoking for some adults, wearing certain forms of jewelry, a silk hat, even, possibly earrings, are all usually destitute of any intrinsic moral importance in themselves, especially for adults who can afford the expense. Yet some people object to these. They refer us to Paul writing to the people of Corinth, "If meat maketh my brother to stumble [not offend], I will eat no flesh forever more, that I make not my brother to stumble."

Yet it would seem that the life and teachings of Paul in their total relations aim to strengthen, not to weaken, consciences. Paul employs the word "stumble." We were wrong to call it "offend."

Thus the ethical principle usually adopted here by most of us is that in case of actions of no real moral importance in themselves we may indulge.

## (2) *Actions Which May Become Evil*

But there is another and somewhat more difficult class of problems among these actions of no real moral importance in themselves, actions which, because of education and environment, do undoubtedly often lead to evil. Of such are games, dancing, and the like.

Of course, card-playing is a feature of some forms of gambling; and gambling contributes to a mania which causes infinite loss, especially among persons least able to stand the loss; toys with the very foundations of one's character, in that it is an attempt to get out of society a living without giving anything in return. It is therefore but a mere form of robbery. The depravity of the gambler's spirit has been illustrated by Horace Walpole's story of the man who dropped down at the door of a club-house in London. When he was carried in, the members of the club began to bet, some that the man was dead, others that he was not. When it was proposed to treat the poor unfortunate for his recovery, the gamblers objected on the ground that "it would affect the fairness of the bet."

Undoubtedly billiards is often a form of gambling. Undoubtedly some people cannot dance together and be decent in thought and feeling. Undoubtedly games of chance pander to the spirit of selfishness, for no one plays for the sake of losing. Undoubtedly a public dance, where any *roué* may go by paying his fee at the door, is no fit place for woman or self-respecting man. Undoubtedly miscellaneous dancing, or an all-night ball, is always vicious. Undoubtedly many a whist party is, as Dr. Munger says, "an organization of inanity." Undoubtedly most horrible abuses cluster around the theater.

But, after all, these are but the abuses of what in themselves are innocent and harmless. So the intelligent man tries to regulate his behavior by intelligent standards. He believes, at all events, that amusements are not by any means the best or even any considerable amount of the best portion of a good man's life. He sees the utter failure of the lives of mere pleasure. He admires the experimenting minority who make books, nature, art, and high behavior paramount. He resents the narrowness which asks is it wrong to play this or that game. He is pleased at the more rational atti-



tude, say, of the girl who will play any game wholesomely and with spirit at the proper time, especially if she reveals at some time or other a little interest in intelligent things, such matters as the women characters of Shakespeare; or in the real life of the Alcotts; or in the best books on art or home-making. He acknowledges that the world is too much bent upon amusements of a light and profitless kind. With Douglas Jarrold, he, too, would that the world might get rid of "this eternal guffaw." Among the frivolous and unhappy searchers after mere pleasure, he seeks out those few sincere and earnest-minded ones who are pursuing and attaining the real prizes of life. Not that he looks upon fun as evil. There is something especially impressive for him in Carlyle's appreciation of the enjoyment in Shakespeare. While not blaming Dante for his misery, yet he with Carlyle likes Shakespeare the better for his laughter. Not that Shakespeare had no sorrows:

"Those sonnets of his will ever testify expressly in what deep waters he had waded, and swum struggling for his life;—as what men like him ever failed to have to do? But observe his mirthfulness, his genuine overflowing love of laughter. Fiery oburgations, words that pierce and burn, are to be found in Shakespeare; yet he is always in measure here; never what Johnson would remark as a specially 'good hater.' But his laughter seems to pour from him in floods; he heaps all manner of ridiculous nicknames on the butt he is bantering, tumbles and tosses him in all sorts of horse-play; you would say, with his heart laughs. Not at mere weakness, at misery, or poverty; never. No man who can laugh, what we call laughing will laugh, and have the credit of wit, that does so. Laughter means sympathy; good laughter is not 'the crackling of thorns under the pot.' Even at stupidity and pretension this Shakespeare does not laugh other than genially. Dogberry and Verges tickle our very hearts; and we dismiss them covered with explosions of laughter; but we like the poor fellows only the better for our laughing; and hope they will get on well there, and continue presidents of the city watch. Such laughter, like sunshine on the deep sea, is very beautiful to me."

The intelligent modern man must have fun and much of it. But experience leads him to see with Ruskin that:

"All real and wholesome enjoyments possible to man have been just as possible to him since he first was made of the earth as they are now. To watch the corn grow and the blossoms set, to draw hard breath over ploughshare and spade, to read, to think, to love, to hope, to pray; these are the things that make men happy."

This intelligent modern man listens to another analytical Englishman:

"There are indeed but few who know how to be idle and innocent, or have a relish of any pleasures that are not criminal; every diversion they take is at the expense of some one virtue, or another, and their very first step out of business is into vice or folly. A man should endeavor, therefore, to make the sphere of his innocent pleasures as wide as possible, that he may retire into them with safety, and find in them such a satisfaction as a wise man would not blush to take."

Surely, experience with behavior leads any careful observer to agree that these words from the genial Addison are perennially significant.

The student of human behavior recognizes that there is a decided difference between mere amusements, which are but the stimulation from the outside, and true enjoyment, which is an inner satisfaction springing from the self-initiated play of one's own interesting consciousness. Real enjoyment cannot depend helplessly for long upon amusing things prepared from without. Our best enjoyment comes from within. Neither is the spirit of cold calculation about the good of it all a sign of merit. The spontaneous overflow of natural fun is the best fun. Looking upon recreations as a business, a serious necessity to be taken as medicine, is usually a painful exhibition of morals on a spree. This seriousness often becomes ludicrous in the playing of games, and exhibits itself disgracefully in anger or petulance when beaten in play. To be sure, games should be played to win if possible; but it is a mean spirit that exults unkindly in victory on the one hand or feels the least bitter in defeat on the other. Play is both legitimate and necessary. It is the genesis of health and of all art. There is, however, an inevitable ennui in all excess. Enjoyment depends utterly upon the attitude one has toward one's work, just as the nature of work depends utterly upon one's attitude toward one's enjoyments.

The criterion of behavior must be sought in the realm of motives. As a real friend once put it, "We must look out for the 'Four W's': the Where, the Why, the When, and the With Whom."

Playing games in one's own home and playing the same in disreputable places are two different cases; hence something depends upon the Where. Playing them in the innocent enjoyment of them and playing them for money suggests that something depends upon the Why. Talking peace when men can listen and reason is one thing, but talking it when guns are trained at your children is another; thus the When is pertinent. Finally, as honest persons do not hob-nob with ruffians or walk the streets with criminals knowingly, so men and nations try to avoid the scandals of evil associations; therefore there is a principle involved in the question of With Whom. Thus in the light of the possible effect of individual behavior upon others it seems to be mandatory that we attend to the W's: the Where, the Why, the When, and the With Whom.

If in the spirit of right reason and courtesy these principles be sanely noted and acted upon, intelligent men decide for the most part that they may safely indulge in those actions the normal effect of which they feel sure is of no intrinsic moral importance; and this though others do not agree. Furthermore, most men accept the principle that this is so even with a line of action which under some conditions undoubtedly becomes evil. They decide that the rule in either case should be, at least on occasion, indulgence.

#### CERTAIN CONCLUSIONS

There are individual actions of moral dignity in themselves. Some of these actions invariably lead to evil. Many of them are evil for some, but not for all. There are not a few which are good for some of us, but which

other people may consider evil for them. Then there are those actions of no moral dignity in themselves which some people, however, feel are of moral dignity; and, finally, there are those actions innocent enough in themselves which under certain circumstances may become evil. Out of this complex arise a large number of those conflicts which give rise to the madness of which the learned psychiatrist complains in the quotation with which this article begins.

Thus the problem of individual human behavior, in the light of the possible effect such behavior may have upon another, is both somewhat intricate and difficult of solution; but, as Dr. Paton suggests, it is something to know that there is a problem. Some one has said that history is philosophy teaching by example. It is so with life. Every man teaches philosophy to his acquaintances, none the less important even if it is unconsciously done. In "Each and All" Emerson expresses the thought:

"Nor knowest thou what argument  
Thy life to thy neighbor's creed hath lent.  
All are needed by each one;  
Nothing is fair or good alone."

Thus there are incentives enough to cease the living habitually in petty irritation over the little faults in others, to stop striving narrowly and meanly for mere pleasure among the things narrow and mean. Enjoyment, of course enjoyment; but there can be no enjoyment for him who can ignore the miraculous sweep of Beauty as she opens up the glories of dawn, paints with Venetian pageants the recurring eventides, or throws her sublime stars across the mystic night.

Rational individual behavior is only that philanthropic way of living which, conforming as far as possible to generally recognized standards, enables men to hear and to understand the seer and hero from out the realms of books, to see clearly down the fair vistas in the genuine halls of art, to welcome "high behavior in man or maid" around him daily, to love nobly, and to face the future with a creative zest.

The war has taught anew that common sense demands a thrifty prudential concern for the materials of life; but there is also an uncommon sense clearly important, which concerns itself with the genuine enduring things which mold and control the materials. It is there where dwells the life of the spirit that lies the perfected behavior, because it is only there that men find the true, worthy, ultimate forces that overcome death with life.

Thus there is no enduring solution of the problems affecting human behavior which does not start from within. Just as men see on the panorama ever passing through and before them only that which they already have within them to see with, so their influence upon others will be measured not so much by what they try to accomplish in that regard as by just what they really are at the time in sincerity and in truth. The life humbly in process of continuous enrichment is the only life of any enduring influence for good.

Out of some such spirit, in spite of the war, despairing human beings may take up their tasks again, obtain their essential food and clothes and shelter, rear their serviceable creations, and ward off that madness which threatens liberty.

## UNFAIR COMPETITION IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND COMMERCE

By HON. HUSTON THOMPSON, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSIONER

AS THE world began to fight its way out of the miasma produced by the war, it discovered that monopoly was occupying the seats of the mighty and trying to justify its right to them. Reports from the legislative halls and the declarations in the trade journals of the nations demonstrate this.

Great Britain, aroused, has had a preliminary investigation and is now considering the creation of a body similar to our Federal Trade Commission. They are debating the passage of an act in the Danish Parliament to create a body with powers to meet this octopus. Our neighbor, Canada, set the machinery of its Board of Commerce, an agency similar to our Federal Trade Commission, in motion July 7, 1919. Australia has also taken unto itself a commission. We hear through the press that the Argentine is devising ways and means to throttle this barnacle.

It is but natural that monopoly should have slipped in during the war. When nations are attacked by those which have enthroned monopoly the defender must assume a similar artificial state and standardize itself as a single unit. But since war is unnatural and peace the natural state, just so the monopolistic tendency of the unnatural state must now undergo a major operation and competition must be restored.

As the noise of battle receded we heard the mellifluous tones of those who argued for the benefits springing from the unification of competitors. The governmental control that compelled the shoe manufacturers to eliminate two-thirds of the several hundred styles of shoes during war times, or contemplated cutting down the styles of safety razors and lawn-mowers to a single product in a given class, secured a saving that the national peril demanded. The autocratic power of war did that. Would we stay the hand or check the brain of an industry in such a way in peace times when education in the industry and competition could accomplish the same result? It is ever the desire of monopoly when it is in the perfect flower to remain in *statu quo*. Then it cries aloud for a parental form of government under whose wings it can hide. Just now the voice of those seeking parental protection is very articulate.

### Evolution of Fair Play in American Business Life

The American business man is human. He is a good sportsman and seeks nothing more than a fair field. There are, however, Philistines in every industry, and when in the stress of the competitive game our sportsman found the Philistine using backstair methods he sometimes thought, if he would survive, he must adopt the same methods. When the heavy hand of the Federal Trade Commission, a new and unknown institution of the Government, threw a lyddite shell in the form of a complaint into an industry at the instigation of some competitor who was going down for the third time, there was immediate resentment. The universal defense was that "everybody is doing it." There surged up and